



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,826	03/12/2004	Danielle Renee Forget Shield	020976-00100	8615
22904 7590 03/02/2009 LOCKE LORD BISSELL & LIDDELL LLP ATTN: IP DOCKETING 600 TRAVIS SUITE 3400 HOUSTON, TX 77002-3095				
EXAMINER RIVIERE, HEIDI M				
ART UNIT 3689		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 03/02/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

hoip@lockelord.com

Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.

10/799,826

Applicant(s)

FORGET SHIELD, DANIELLE
RENEE

Examiner

HEIDI RIVIERE

Art Unit

3689

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 January 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____
Claim(s) objected to: _____
Claim(s) rejected: _____
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Tan Dean D. Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3689

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner has carefully reviewed the Applicant's request for reconsideration but does not find Applicant's arguments persuasive. The claims in the present application were rejected using 35 USC 103. Applicant first argues that the Kasik reference fails to teach limitations addressed by the Hershey reference. In response to applicant's piecemeal analysis of the references, "one cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where, as here, the rejections are based on combinations of references." In re Keller, Terry, and Davies, 208 USPQ 871, 882 (CCPA 1981). In the instant case, applicant first refutes each prior art reference individually, rather than viewing them in combination, in light of the totality of their combined teachings one of ordinary skill in the art of the invention would understand that the waste reciprocal with the signal transmitting device as part of a paid for service was a asset whose whereabouts would be important to both the owner and the waste collection company. In response to applicant's argument concerning impermissible hindsight, Examiner also asserts that "[a]ny judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning, but so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time claimed invention was made and does not include knowledge gleaned only from applicant's disclosure, reconstruction is proper." In re McLaughlin, 170 USPQ 209, 212 (CCPA 1971). Furthermore, the motivation to combine as detailed in the Hershey or secondary reference states "while goods are an example of assets that need to be tracked, the containers, container trucks and railcars in which the goods are shipped are themselves assets which need to be tracked, not just because of the goods they carry, but also because they represent capital assets typically of a leasing company not associated with the carrier." (Hershey col. 1, lines 15-22). Applicant provides no new arguments that place the application in better form for appeal and therefore this argument for reconsideration is not persuasive.